



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

Am

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/076,207	02/14/2002	Randall G. Banton	0102323-00090	8590

21125 7590 04/22/2003

NUTTER MCCLENNEN & FISH LLP
WORLD TRADE CENTER WEST
155 SEAPORT BOULEVARD
BOSTON, MA 02210-2604

EXAMINER

CHERVINSKY, BORIS LEO

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2835	7

DATE MAILED: 04/22/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/076,207	BANTON ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Boris L. Chervinsky	2835

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 February 2002.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 14 February 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4,5,6. 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the claims must be preceded by the sentence "I (or we) claim" or "The invention claim is" or equivalent.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 1-20 are objected to because of the following informalities: the claims must be thoroughly checked for antecedence basis, e.g. "a slot" in claim 1 is in line 1 and line 2, " a selected circuit board" of claim 15 is already claimed in claim 14, therefore all articles must be placed properly to be grammatically correct.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
4. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 21 is vague and indefinite because it is misdescriptive and grammatically incorrect.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-7, 8-12, 13, 17-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grouell et al.

Grouell discloses the digital processor chassis comprising a card cage 21 with coverings having airflow inlets and outlets and fan assembly to produce airflow, the chassis having slots to dispose slidable components 41, airflow apertures 27 are disposed adjacent the slots for entering and exiting airflow either from one edge of the slidable component or from the opposite edge, the slidable components are shaped similar and present the same impedance to airflow. Grouell et al disclose the claimed invention but shows disk drives as slidable components instead circuit boards and does not specify method of making such as brazing, It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to use the chassis for the circuit boards as shown in many of prior art references of record and it is obvious that in this case the presence of process limitations in the article claims which limitations do not otherwise distinguish the current article from the prior art cannot impart patentability to that product.

7. Claims 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grouell et al. in view of Melville et al.

Grouell discloses the claimed invention except a circuit board comprising a plenum.

Melville discloses the circuit board 44 comprising a substrate and components mounted on the substrate, the circuit board is slidable into slots of the card cage and includes a cover 34, 50 comprising a plenum for airflow. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to use the circuit board as disclosed by Melville et al. in the device disclosed by Grouell et al. for efficient heat dissipation.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Boris L. Chervinsky whose telephone number is 703-308-5429. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Darren E. Schuberg can be reached on 703-308-4815. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9318 for regular communications and 703-872-9319 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-5115.

**BORIS CHERVINSKY
PRIMARY EXAMINER**



April 16, 2003